



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,213	03/23/2004	You-sub Lee	1572.1278	1639
21171	7590	11/27/2007		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER NATNAEL, PAULO S M	
			ART UNIT 2622	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/806,213	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Paulos M. Natnael	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims **1, 3-9, 11 and 13-15** are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al., U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. **2002/0171774**.

Considering claims **1, 8,9,15**, Lee discloses a display apparatus and a tuner module mounted thereon. The display apparatus 1, as illustrated in FIG. 4, includes a front cover 10 and a rear cover 20 ([and cover 26a, which accommodates tuner-mounted board/unit 50a], corresponds to the claimed back-case 50) coupled to each other and forming a predetermined accommodating space therebetween, an LCD panel 30 having an effective surface on which a picture is displayed, a PCB supporting member 40 having a main PCB 41 and a connection port 47 and supporting LCD panel 30, and a TV tuner unit 50 detachably attached at rear cover 20 and receiving the TV video signal, (corresponding to the sub-case 70) transmitting the TV video signal to main PCB 41 through connection port 47 and outputting the TV video signal. Herein, "the effective

surface" denotes a front surface of LCD panel 30 exposed through front cover 10. (See, paragraph [0034]; Fig.4) The claimed baseboard is met by the board that accommodates the tuner-mounted unit 50. And as shown in Figs. 5,6, 7 and 8, the TV tuner unit 50 which corresponds to the claimed sub-case) comprises a TV tuner 51, video decoder 58, and connector 57. The TV tuner PCB 52 can be removed easily from the main PCB 41. As to the claimed blocking electromagnetic interferences, Lee specifically discloses that "when TV tuner unit 50 is inserted into tuner unit accommodating part 21, both ends of earth spring 25 contact LCD panel 30 while a portion of earth spring 25 exposed outside tuner unit accommodating part 21 contacts, as shown in FIG. 5, the earth terminal 70 of a TV tuner 51 contained within TV tuner unit 50. Thus, harmful electromagnetic waves generated from TV tuner unit 50 can be removed. (see paragraphs 0039, 0041; emphasis added). Therefore, Lee discloses all claimed subject matter.

As to claims **3, 11**, Lee discloses the accommodating part 21a (Fig.9).

Considering claim **4, 13**, Lee discloses a stand or a supporter 2, fig.3.

Considering claim 5, Lee discloses the rear cover 20, fig.9;

Regarding claims 6, Lee discloses stand 2, fig.3;

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Lee discloses FIGS. 6 and 9, for example, which illustrate the sub or tuner PCB combined or attached to the main PCB 41 to provide a convenience for mounting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2,10,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Shatas et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,323,298.

As to claim 2,10 and 12, Lee discloses a cover (shield) 26 and locking hooks 27, (fig.4). Lee does not specifically disclose the cover is made of material that blocks EM waves. However, Lee discloses that "when TV tuner unit 50 is inserted into tuner unit accommodating part 21, both ends of earth spring 25 contact LCD panel 30 while a portion of earth spring 25 exposed outside tuner unit accommodating part 21 contacts, as shown in FIG. 5, the earth terminal 70 of a TV tuner 51 contained within TV tuner unit 50. Thus, harmful electromagnetic waves generated from TV tuner unit 50 can be removed. Such shielding plates or material for shielding the electronic circuitry from harmful EMI waves, interference, or signals are notoriously well known in the art of video or image display. In this regard, for example, Shatas et al. discloses an integral

enclosure and shield for EMI radiating circuitry comprising a rear cover symmetrical to said front cover and fitting within said rear opening and having second opposed side regions, each covering an interior rear portion of a respective one of said junctures, said rear cover of a material for blocking electromagnetic radiation. (See, col. 1, lines 25-38 and col. 6, lines 30-36) Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Lee by providing such a shielding material to protect or shield the circuitry from harmful EM waves or signals generated from the tuner or other, outside sources.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9-13-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that (1) "it is the sub-case that is defined as being detachably connected to a main case...(2) Lee et al. does not teach that TV tuner accommodating part 21 is detachable. (3) Even assuming that the casing 53, which forms a housing with casing 54 to accommodate TV tuner 51 is a sub-casing, lee et al. does not teach or suggest that casings 53 and 54 block electromagnetic radiation. (4) Shatas does not add anything that would remedy the deficiency in Lee et al.

The examiner disagrees. The tuner unit corresponding to the claimed sub-case meets the first of the argument. That is to say, Lee specifically discloses that, "when TV tuner unit 50 is inserted into tuner unit accommodating part 21, both ends of earth spring 25 contact LCD panel 30 while a portion of earth spring 25 exposed outside tuner unit accommodating part 21 contacts, as shown in FIG. 5, the earth terminal 70 of a TV

tuner 51 contained within TV tuner unit 50. Thus, harmful electromagnetic waves generated from TV tuner unit 50 can be removed. (see paragraph 0041; emphasis added). It is clear harmful electromagnetic waves are being removed by this method. Further, as shown above, the TV tuner unit 50a corresponds to the claimed sub-case detachably connected to the main case, which tuner unit 50a has mounted on it a video board, i.e. the tuner board. Therefore, the argument that the TV tuner accommodating part 21 must be the detachable part in order to meet the claim, is unpersuasive. Furthermore, the casings 53 and 54 are part of the tuner unit. Note also that the claims broadly recite "sub-case". As to the argument against Shatas et al., the reference discloses an integral enclosure and shield for EMI radiating circuitry comprising a rear cover symmetrical to said front cover and fitting within said rear opening and having second opposed side regions, each covering an interior rear portion of a respective one of said junctures, said rear cover of a material for blocking electromagnetic radiation. (See, col. 1, lines 25-38 and col. 6, lines 30-36) The disclosure of Shatas illustrates that materials for blocking EMI have notoriously been well-known in the art. Therefore, the arguments are unpersuasive.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paulos M. Natnael whose telephone number is (571) 272-7354. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571)272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/806,213
Art Unit: 2622

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Paulos M. Nathael
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2622

November 23, 2007